

REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-28 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, it appears that the Examiner is objecting to the means language in the claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are deleting the means plus function elements in independent Claims 1, 7, 13 and 21. Applicants are also adding the feature to independent Claims 1 and 13 of the thickness of the first insulating film on the second region being thinner than the thickness of the first insulating film on the first region (this is supported, e.g., by page 18 of the specification of the present application) and adding the feature to independent Claims 7 and 21 of the concentration of impurity elements in the first region being larger than the concentration of impurity elements in the second region (this is supported, e.g., by page 18 of the specification of the present application). This should overcome the Examiner's objection to the claims, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-2, 4, 7-8 and 10 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Tempel et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended the claims as explained above.

Applicants submit that Tempel does not disclose these features. Therefore, the claims are patentable over this reference, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 13-14 and 21-22 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Tempel and further in view of Ra. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For substantially the same reasons discussed above, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants are also submitting new Claims 43-50 herewith. If any fee is due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 14, 2004



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500